



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/939,227	08/24/2001	David Eugene Hirth	284-09555-US	4072

87884 7590 10/08/2010
Mossman, Kumar and Tyler, PC
P.O. Box 421239
Houston, TX 77242

EXAMINER

THOMPSON, KENNETH L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3672

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

10/08/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket@mktlaw.us.com
tthigpen@mktlaw.us.com

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's attorney and the examiner agreed to an examiner's amendment to the claims to show underlined and strikethrough of all limitations added or deleted. Please note attached claims.

Applicants's attorney and the examiner discussed whether the application is abandoned because a final rejection was issued on 2 February 2010. Applicants indicated that a response to the final rejection was made 12 April 2010 that addressed the only requirement, a supplemental declaration, in the final rejection barring allowance of the application. Applicants's attorney and the examiner discussed whether the reissue application was guilty of recapture. Applicant's attorney reminded the examiner that the issue was refuted in an Appeal Brief filed 8 August 2003 in response to a final rejection made by a previous examiner, now retired, that included a 35 USC 251 rejection of the new claims 21-36. Applicants stated that an examiner's answer was not received nor did the application proceed to the Board of Appeals and Interferences, and additionally; that the previous examiner re-opened prosecution without addressing the arguments traversing the recapture rejection. The current examiner reviewed the arguments and after further research agreed. Applicants attorney and the examiner agreed that no evidence supporting guilt of recapture has been presented nor is of record that would refute applicants arguments outlined in the Appeal Brief.

Applicants attorney and the examiner discussed whether the error was improper. All agreed that the broadening reissue presented claims directed to the non-metallic landing collar or the apparatus for selective obstruction of a tubular by holding an object thereon as claimed.